6th August 1954]

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" On 1st February 1954, a sum of Rs. 1,41,780–7–11 was the total Government loan outstanding against the Madras Co-operative Milk Supply Union and the amount of loan overdue on that date was Rs. 30,889–13–11."

Promulgation of section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code in Payyoli, North Malabar.

* 1114 *Q.*—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether an order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code was promulgated in Payyoli, North Malabar, on 19th March 1954 prohibiting public meetings in the place ; and

(*b*) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" (*a*) & (*b*) A statement[a] is laid on the table of the House."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" Are the Government aware of the fact that it was only the Communist Party which published the notice first, fixing the meeting and it was only subsequently, the anti-Communist Front issued notice fixing their meeting at the same place? That being the case, will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state, why the Magistrate, instead of allowing the party which applied first to hold its meeting, prohibited all meetings? May I request the Government to issue an order so as to allow all political parties to hold their meetings without any interference from others? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Here was an imminent danger of breach of the peace because two parties wanted to hold a meeting at the same place and at the same time. An enquiry into which party wanted to hold the meeting first would have led to a breach of the peace and that is why an order under Section 144 was promulgated, and after that there was no trouble."

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR :—" Sir, the statement placed on the table of the House by the Hon. the Minister for Finance is as vague as possible and is also contrary to facts. Therefore, may I know from the Hon. Minister what he means by the words ' at the same time ' in line 5 of the memorandum placed on the table? Do they denote that the application for holding a meeting by the Anti-Communist Front or the announcement regarding the holding of the meeting by the Anti-Communist Front was made on the same day as that on which the Communist Party also announced their meeting? Also it is said in the memorandum that ' attempts were made to persuade the rival parties to have their meetings on different dates but without success '. May I know who made these attempts? " 11–50 a.m.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 79 infra.

[6th August 1954

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will give the hon. Member an opportunity to put another supplementary question regarding the second point raised by him."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, my information is that the two parties wanted to hold their meetings at the same time and at the very same place. There was, therefore, a likelihood of breach of the peace. So, an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was passed to cover 24 hours."

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR :—" Sir, my point was as to when the meeting of the Anti-Communist Front was announced. May I know whether it was not announced a week after the announcement made by the Communist Party of Kurumbranad taluk? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, this is not in any way relevant to the question in dispute here. As a matter of fact, the question was whether there was a likelihood of any breach of the peace. Whether it was due to the fault of the Communist Party or the Anti-Communist Front, there was such a likelihood and in order to prevent it, an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was passed immediately restricting its operation to only 24 hours."

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR :—" Sir, you have already promised me an opportunity to put another question. I want a further clarification."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have already given the hon. Member a second opportunity."

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—" Sir, this kind of a situation is not a peculiar one. Where two organizations hold their meetings at the same time and at the same place, it is true that, on some occasions, serious disorders have been caused. Instead of adopting a policy of banning all meetings at the place, the Government should make enquiries and decide which of the meetings should be banned. Why should not the Government take a leaf out of the recent Indo-China negotiations and appoint a Truce Commission in such matters to arrive at a decision? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, even for making enquiries, some time is required and here was a case where there was an imminent likelihood of a breach of the peace which had to be prevented first."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" ஒரு இடத்தில் ஒரு பொதுக் கூட்டத்தை நடத்தப்போவதாக கம்யூனிஸ்டுக்கட்சி அறிவித்த உடனேயே வேறு ஒரு கட்சி அந்த இடத்தில் அக்கூட்டத்தை நடத்தவிடாமல் பண்ணவேண்டுமென் பதற்காக தாங்களும் கூட்டம் நடத்தப்போவதாக அறிவித்து விட்டால் உடனே இரண்டு கட்சிகளும் தங்கள் தங்கள் கூட்டங்களை நடத்தக்கூடாது என்று தடைவிதிப்பதானது சரியல்ல. இம்மாதிரி செய்தால் இனிமேல் வேண்டுமென்றே ஒவ்வொரு கூட்டத்தையும் நடத்தவிடாமல் பண்ணவேண்டு மென்பதற்காக சில கட்சிகள் தாங்களும் கூட்டம் நடத்தப்போவதாக அறிவிக்கக்கூடும். நாட்டு மக்களின் பிரஜா உரிமையைப் பாதுகாப்பதற்காக யார்

முதலில் கூட்டம் நடத்தப் போவதாக அறிவித்தார்களோ அவர்களுக்குக் கூட்டம் நடத்த அனுமதியை அளித்து, அவர்களுக்குப் போட்டியாக அக்கூட்டத்தை தடைசெய்யும் உத்தேசத்துடன் பின்னர் எக்கட்சி அவ்விடத்தில் கூட்டம் நடத்தப்போவதாக அறிவித்தாலும் அதைத் தடை செய்ய சர்க்கார் முன் வருமா ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, this is the very reason why in certain places we have laid down a rule that the parties should take out licences for holding meetings. In the present case, it was a rural area where no such licence was required and there was the likelihood of a clash between the two parties as they wanted to hold their meetings at the same time and at the same place. On the particular day that it came to the notice of the Magistrate, there was no time even for holding an enquiry. He therefore tried to persuade the parties to arrange the meetings at separate places. Even this was not possible and he, therefore, had immediately to pass an order under Section 144, Criminal Procedure Code.”

Grant of scholarships to students of Harijan and backward class communities.

* 1115 Q.—SRI S. RAMALINGAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state the number of applications received and sanctioned during the year 1953–54 for scholarships from—

(a) Harijan residential college students;

(b) Harijan non-residential college students;

(c) Backward community residential college students; and

(d) Backward community non-residential college students?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN :—“ A statement[a] containing the particulars is placed on table of the House.”

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—“ சர்க்கார் கொடுத்திருக்கும் பதிலில் சென்ற ஆண்டில் உபகாரச் சம்பளம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று விண்ணப்பம் செய்து கொண்ட ஹரிஜன மாணவர்களில் 75 பேர்களுக்கும், பிற்பட்ட இனத்து மாணவர்களில் 124 பேர்களுக்கும் உபகாரச்சம்பளம் மறுக்கப் பட்டதாக சொல்லப்பட்டு இருக்கிறது. அதற்குக் காரணம் என்னவென்று கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன் ? ”

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN :—“ Sir, only a few students have been refused scholarships. They were refused because in some cases, sufficient particulars were not supplied in the application forms and in a few cases, it was due to lack of funds.”

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—“ Sir, does the reference to ‘ collegiate residential scholarships ’ include students of the Law College also? ”

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN :—“ Sir, it does not include them.”

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 79 infra.